

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION

BRYAN KANU,  
Plaintiff,  
  
vs.

CITY OF CINCINNATI, et al.,  
Defendants.

Case No. 1:19-cv-156  
Dlott, J.  
Litkovitz, M.J.

**REPORT AND  
RECOMMENDATION**

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's motions to supplement the complaint an eighth time (Doc. 37) and eleventh time (Doc. 40). For the reasons set forth in the October 29, 2019 Report and Recommendation, plaintiff's motions should be **DENIED** as moot. *See* Doc. 52 at 12 and n.1.

**IT IS SO RECOMMENDED.**

Date: 1/17/19

  
Karen L. Litkovitz  
United States Magistrate Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
WESTERN DIVISION**

BRYAN KANU,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.

Case No: 1:19-cv-156  
Dlott, J.  
Litkovitz, M.J.

CITY OF CINCINNATI et al.,  
Defendants.

**NOTICE**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b), **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy of the recommended disposition, a party may serve and file specific written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. This period may be extended further by the Court on timely motion for an extension. Such objections shall specify the portions of the Report objected to and shall be accompanied by a memorandum of law in support of the objections. If the Report and Recommendation is based in whole or in part upon matters occurring on the record at an oral hearing, the objecting party shall promptly arrange for the transcription of the record, or such portions of it as all parties may agree upon, or the Magistrate Judge deems sufficient, unless the assigned District Judge otherwise directs. A party may respond to another party's objections **WITHIN 14 DAYS** after being served with a copy thereof. Failure to make objections in accordance with this procedure may forfeit rights on appeal. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947 (6th Cir. 1981).